



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,821	04/28/2000	Michael Lorenz	ACD-01000US0-KJD	4627

28554 7590 06/29/2005

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 MARKET STREET, SUITE 540
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/560,821

Applicant(s)

LORENZ ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B. Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-16 and 18-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-16 and 18-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-11 and 13-16, and 18-27 are currently pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 19 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claims 19 and 27 recite the limitation "the embedded code" in their limitations. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-11 and 13-16, 18, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,006,265 to Rangan et al..
6. As to claim 1, Rangan teaches a method for obtaining streaming content from a processing device network, comprising: requesting an interface program from a first processing device in the processing device network (col. 18, lines 34-50); downloading the interface program to a second processing device in the processing device network (col. 18, lines 34-50); displaying a user interface on a display of the second processing device (col. 18, lines 34-50); requesting by the interface program a streaming media file from a third processing device on the

Art Unit: 2142

processing device network (col. 18, lines 34-50); downloading the streaming media file to the second processing device, wherein the streaming media file includes an embedded code (col. 18, lines 34-50); detecting an embedded code that includes information that represents an address to a remote URL (col. 20, lines 34-57); spawning a the remote URL interface process that retrieves objects from a data store by the interface program in response to the information that represents an address (col. 20, lines 34-57); parsing the embedded code into a plurality of code segments by the process; querying a memory location in the data store responsive to a code segment in the plurality of code segments (col. 20, lines 34-57); and responding to rules in the memory location (col. 20, lines 34-57); however Rangan does not explicitly teach that the URL is a CGI program.

Official Notice is taken that CGI programs, accessible by URL's, were well known at the time of the applicant's invention.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention regarding the embedding of URL's in streaming media with the concept of using a CGI as a URL because Rangan displays dynamic content and a CGI program would be a logical choice for presenting dynamic content.

7. As to claim 2, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the rules include updating the displayed user interface with a high resolution image stored in the data store and providing video responsive to the streaming media file (Figure 6).

8. As to claim 3, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first processing device and the second processing device are different process devices (col. 20, lines 34-57).

9. As to claim 4, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the second processing device is a personal computer having a web browser (col. 20, lines 34-57).

Art Unit: 2142

10. As to claim 5, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the second processing device is a box coupled to a television (A computer is a box that can be coupled to a television).

11. As to claims 6 and 7, Rangan does not explicitly teach the streaming media files being the .asf and .rm formats; however Official notice is taken that such formats were well known for streaming media at the time of the applicant's invention.

12. As to claim 8, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the displayed user interface includes a first window, a second window, and a third window, wherein video is provided in the first window, a high resolution image is provided in the second window and text is provided in the third window (Figure 6).

13. As to claim 9, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the third processing device is a media server (col. 18, lines 34-50).

14. As to claim 10, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the downloading step includes buffering a portion of the streaming media file (col. 18, lines 34-50).

15. As to claim 11, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the embedded code is a metadata time code having a format of a process identification, a variable and a target destination (col. 19, lines 58-col. 20, line 14).

16. As to claim 13, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the embedded code is a metadata time code (col. 19, lines 58-col. 20, line 14).

17. As to claim 14, Rangan teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the responding step includes updating the user interface display (col. 18, lines 34-50).

18. As to claims 15-16, 18, and 20-26, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-11 and 13-14.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 13-16, and 18-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is 571-272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2142

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

Douglas Blair
June 27, 2005

DBB



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER